## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Initially, an Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) in conformity with requirements of 37 C.F.R. § 1.97-1.98 was filed on December 19, 2007. The reference cited in the IDS has not yet been acknowledged or made of record by the Examiner. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the reference cited in the IDS filed on December 19, 2007 be acknowledged. Although the reference cited in the IDS is in Japanese, an English translation of the Japanese Office Action that cited the reference was filed along with the IDS. MPEP §609.04(b) states

Where the information listed is not in the English language, but was cited in a search report or other action by a foreign patent office in a counterpart foreign application, the requirement for a concise explanation of relevance can be satisfied by submitting an English-language version of the search report or action which indicates the degree of relevance found by the foreign office.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the reference cited in the IDS filed on December 19, 2007 be acknowledged, and an initialed PTO 1449 form be provided to the undersigned.

Claims 5, 14, and 34 are pending in the present application, Claim 5 having been amended, and Claims 1-4, 6-13, and 15-33 having been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter is added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1-3, 7, 8, 11, and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by <u>Lennon</u> (U.S. Patent No. 6,718,063); Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over <u>Lennon</u> in view of <u>Tanaka et al.</u> (U.S. Patent No. 5,943,442); Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over <u>Lennon</u> in view of Oian et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,195,450); Claims 14 and 34 were allowed; and

Application No. 10/680,256

Reply to Office Action of May 22, 2008

Claim 5 was objected to for depending from a rejected base claim, but was otherwise

indicated as including allowable subject matter.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the allowance of Claims 14 and 34 and the

indication of allowable subject matter in Claim 5. In order to place this application in

condition for allowance, Claim 5 is amended to be written in independent form, and the

rejected and withdrawn claims are canceled.

Consequently, in light of the above discussion and in view of the present amendment,

the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance and an early and favorable

action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,

MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000 Fax: (703) 413 -2220

(OSMMN 06/04)

I:\ATTY\UW\243490US\243490US\_AM DUE 8-22-08.DOC

Eckhard H/Kuesters

Attorney of Record

Registration No. 28,870

Joseph Wrkich

Registration No. 53,796